

### REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed July 26, 2005. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 11, and 12 were pending in this Application. Claims 5-10 were cancelled due to an election/restriction requirement. Claims 1-4, 11 and 12 were rejected. Claims 1, 11, and 12 have been amended to further define various features of Applicants' invention. Claims 13-19 have been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 12 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,178,563 issued to Carl G. Reed ("Reed"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the cited art does not teach all of the elements of the claimed embodiment of the invention.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Furthermore, "the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co. Ltd.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art as anticipatory by the Examiner cannot anticipate the rejected Claims, because the cited art does not show all the elements of the present Claims.

According to the present claims, a contacting component comprises a conductor device onto which a first plastic component and, separately from it, a second plastic component are molded, which is bendable such that the first plastic component can engage the second plastic component to provide integral contacting component. The Examiner stated that Reed discloses such a device. Applicants respectfully disagree. Reed merely discloses to form a part of a conducting component by two plastic components. As can be seen in Figure 13 of Reed, elements 36 and 38 cannot form by themselves an integral contacting component. Reed requires an additional component 22 to be coupled with the components 36 and 38 to actually provide a contacting component. This additional component is necessary

to actually form the socket of the contacting component. Such an additional element is not necessary with the arrangement according to the present independent claims. To clarify this feature of the present application, Applicants amended the independent claims to include the limitation that the two plastic components form after bending a single integral component.

Furthermore, Applicants added claims 15 and 16 which include the limitation that the first plastic component comprises a first and second section which form a 90 degree angled plastic component. The second plastic component engages with the second section of the first plastic component. None of the cited references discloses such an arrangement. Applicants also added new independent claim 17 which includes the limitations of former independent claim 1 and newly added dependent claim 15.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 2 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed in view of U.S. Patent 5,619,012 issued to David C. Casali et al. ("Casali et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the cited art combinations, even if proper, which Applicants do not concede, does not render the claimed embodiment of the invention obvious.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the references cited by the Examiner must disclose all claimed limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). Furthermore, according to § 2143 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

With respect to independent claim 11, the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims are valid for this rejection. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully

submit that the dependent Claim 2 is allowable at least to the extent of the independent Claim 1 to which it refers, respectively. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the dependent Claim 2. Applicants reserve the right to make further arguments regarding the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), if necessary, and do not concede that the Examiner's proposed combinations are proper.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have now made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims as amended.

Applicants enclose a check in the amount of \$200.00 for a new independent claim. Applicants believe there are no additional fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2545.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorney for Applicants



Andreas Grubert  
Limited Recognition No. L0225  
Limited Recognition Under 37 C.F.R. §11.9(b)

Date: October 26, 2005

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **31625**  
512.322.2545  
512.322.8383 (fax)